

Application No. 10/823,925

Reply to Office Action of 10/12/2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is requested.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9 are currently amended. Claims 6, 10, 11, 12 and 13 remain as-filed.

Basis for the amendment of claims may be found in the specification in paragraphs [0024] - [0026], [0029] - [0031], and in Figs. 2, 3, 6, and 9.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 in that:

In claim 1, lines 2-3, in the phrase “an elastic mechanism, hanging from a wall...”, it is unclear exactly what element is “hanging from a wall”, in the context of the claims, that this is also true in claims 3, 4, and 5.

In claim 1, it is unclear exactly what element the “wall”, “leg”, “annular ridge”, etc... is part of, in the context of the claims, that such an element must be positively claimed, that this is also true in claims 3, 4, and 5.

In claim 1, lines 5-6, it is unclear exactly what element is “prevented from exiting from said hole, in the context of the claims, that this is also true in claims 3, 4 and 5.

In claim 1, line 7, it is unclear exactly what element is “beveled and flexible”, in the context of the claims, that this is also true in claims 3, 4, and 5.

The Examiner states that claims 1-9 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in the Office Action.

The 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection of claims 1-9 is traversed. In amending the claims for clarity, applicant reviewed the Examiner's reasons for indication of allowable subject matter and has not removed such allowable subject matter from the claims. The claims are clarified by adding or removing commas and positively claiming elements to more clearly describe the invention. Elements added in claim 1, their drawing designator numbers stated herein include, first wall 72, annular second wall 130, fastener 116 leg 68, radially extending annular ridge 64.

The amendment clarifies that the elastic mechanism hangs from the wall; that the leg, is part of a fastener, the leg including an annular second wall and a radially extending ridge on the leg; that in claim 1, lines 5-6 the leg is prevented from exiting the hole; that in claim 1, line 7 the ridge is beveled and flexible.

In view of the above amendments and explanation, it is believed that the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection of claims 1-9 is overcome. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn and that claims 1-9 be allowed.

The Examiner has stated that claims 10-13 are allowed.

Applicant has reviewed U.S. Patents No's 500,760 Gerhardt, 179,160 Chase, 4,261,410 Standiford, 997,247 Woerner, 1,107,010 Allen et al., 521,806 Mullikin, 332,773 Altick, 333,775 Oberndorfer, 399,216 Spencer, 873,623 Smith, 817,039 Broome, 1,390,561 Kelly, and 6,145,170 Bernard et al., and Japanese patent JP 07275020A Fumitaka Dobashi, have been reviewed and do not appear to add anything that would contribute to making the invention as described in the claims as amended, obvious.

It is requested that claims 1-13 be allowed.

No additional fee is seen needed for claims.

Respectfully submitted,

 January 7, 2005

Robert A. Seemann Date

Reg. No. 29,857

89 Earl Avenue, Hamden, CT 0654

Tel. (203) 288-2122 Fax. (203) 281-7313